

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 049

CS 500 400

AUTHOR Faules, Don; And Others
TITLE A Research and Developmental Program in Three Basic Communication Courses: Student Reactions and Effects on Communicative Ability.
INSTITUTION Utah Univ., Salt Lake City. Communication Research and Training Lab.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 67p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Basic Skills; Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Skills; *Course Content; Course Objectives; Educational Research; *Higher Education; Language Arts; Oral Communication; *Speech Curriculum; Speech Education; *Speech Instruction; *Student Reaction; Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

This document specifies methods for the evaluation of three different approaches to basic speech communication courses used in higher education. The courses are "Fundamentals of Speech," "Contemporary Issues," and "Communication Process." The first two were designed to produce skilled public speakers and the third was designed to provide students with an understanding of the communication process. Student opinions relating to the success of the courses were sought, as well as those of department chairmen and instructors. Results of this study indicated that one-quarter courses in speech communication can improve the content, language, organization, and general effectiveness of students' speech, but they do not consistently upgrade the delivery of all speech students. Other detailed conclusions pertaining to the three sample courses are also presented. (CH)

ED 081049

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAM IN
THREE BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSES:
STUDENT REACTIONS AND EFFECTS
ON COMMUNICATIVE ABILITY

Don Faules
Steve Littlejohn
Joe Ayres

Communication Research and Training Laboratory

Department of Speech

University of Utah

Salt Lake City, Utah

1968 - 1970

Funded by the Teaching Innovations Committee

University of Utah

AS 500 400

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Program Description	2
Fundamentals of Speech	
Contemporary Issues	
Communicative Process	
Convocations	
In-Service Training	
Nature and Purpose of the Study	6
II. SURVEY OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN	8
Rationale	8
Results	8
Conclusions	9
III. STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE SPEECH I COURSES	11
Method	11
General Findings	12
Textbooks	
Special Lectures	
Courses	
Instructors	
Special Analysis of Student Reactions	17
Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Course Evaluation	
Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Class Grade Average	
Relationship of Course Ratings and Students Final Grades	
Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Convocation Attendance	
Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Textbook Evaluation	
Relationship of Mean Ratings of Instructors and General Course	
Evaluation	
Relationship of Mean Instructor Ratings and Mean Convocation	
Ratings	
Relationship of Mean Course Evaluations and Average Convocation	
Ratings	
Analysis of Teaching Methods	21
Summary of Responses to Teacher Evaluation Forms	
Analysis of Responses	
Discussion of Student Evaluations	31
IV. AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF THREE INSTRUCTIONAL	
METHODS OF SPEAKING EFFECTIVENESS	33
Nature of Study	32
Definition of terms	
Previous Study	
Distinctions between Instructional Methods	

Limitations of the study	
Experimental Questions	
Method	37
Selection of Subjects	
Experimental Design	
Selection of Judges	
Procedure	39
Instructions to Teachers	
Instructions to Students	
Instructions to Judges	
Result and Analysis	41
Criterion of Content	
Criterion of Language	
Criterion of Organization	
Criterion of Delivery	
Criterion of General Effectiveness	
Speaker Ranks	
Analysis of Topic Selection	
Judge Reliability	
Discussion and Conclusions	50
V. APPENDIXES	54
Appendix 1 Relevant Bibliography	
Appendix 2 Speech Information Form	
Appendix 3 Instructions to teachers in Experimental Study	
Appendix 4 Instructions to students in Experimental Study	
Appendix 5 Speech Rating Form	
Appendix 6 Instructions to TV Operators and Timers in Experimental Study	
Appendix 7 Instructions to Judges in Experimental Study	

TABLES

Table

1. Student Reactions to Textbooks	12
2. Student Reactions to Special Lectures	13
3. Student Reactions to the Courses	14
4. Student Reactions toward Instructors	16
5. Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Course Evaluation	17
6. Pearson Produce Moment Correlations Between Average Instructor Evaluations and Average Textbook Ev- aluations for Each Class	20
7. Analysis of Variance of Ratings Given by Expert and Non- Expert Judges to Students on the Criterion of Content and Mean Ratings for Courses and Judges	42
8. Analysis of Variance of Ratings Given by Expert and Non- Expert Judges to Students on the Criterion of Language and Mean Ratings for Courses and Judges	44
9. Analysis of Variance of Ratings Given by Expert and Non-Expert Judges to Students on the Criterion of Or- ganization and Mean Ratings for Courses and Judges	45
10. Analysis of Variance of Ratings Given by Expert and Non-Expert Judges to Students on the Criterion of Delivery and Mean Ratings for Courses and Judges	46
11. Analysis of Variance of Ratings Given by Expert and Non- Expert Judges to Students on the Criterion of General Effectiveness and Mean Ratings for Courses and Judges	48

I. INTRODUCTION

A review of the literature that is relevant to the basic communication courses in the field of Speech suggests that an inordinate amount of time is spent on this segment of learning. However, when one considers the amount of budget that such courses provide, the fact that such courses are the primary recruiting and training program for graduate students, and the fact that such courses are supposed to reflect the nature of a discipline, their importance can not be denied. A more basic question is how is the time used? The bulk of the literature is not based on systematic research. Papers concerning recent developments, innovations, syllabi, subjective criticisms, and suggested improvements are common --- systematic evaluation is more difficult to find. It is evident that directors of basic communication programs do not always have the necessary time and resources for evaluation. Because graduate students must limit their studies to certain aspects of a given basic course, the outcomes do not always give a comprehensive view of a program. Because innovations are more appealing than traditional courses, we have not benefited from findings of comparative studies and our knowledge of traditional criteria of measurement is not as complete as it should be. When this study was first designed there was temptation to adhere strictly to a "behavioral objective" approach to determine any outcomes. However, this did not seem to provide a broad enough base for what will eventually generate a philosophy and method for structuring the basic communication courses. This study represents a beginning that is directed toward further research and evaluation and it is not intended to decide what the basic courses should be. The primary value of the study lies in the ideas and questions generated. The conclusions represent a thrust toward more viable courses for the future.

Program Description

In the fall of 1968, the Department of Speech implemented a Speech I Program that contained three different courses. One of the courses (Fundamentals) was a retention of the course as it had been taught over the past few years. The other two courses (Contemporary Issues and Communication Process) represented deviations in terms of method and content. The primary objective of the program was to develop some superior lower level courses based on a comprehensive research and training program. It should be pointed out that the Fundamentals course as taught preceeding the new program had been a good course according to student ratings. It had not been without its critics and perhaps one of the most valid criticisms was that it did not meet the needs of certain groups of students. Because the course had been required of all students, such a criticism is not surprising. The intent of the variations was to seek improvement and make a judgment about the future.

The fall quarter classes contained 747 students and were divided into 46 sections. Sections were assigned randomly to each type of course -- Fundamentals of Speech 40%, Contemporary Issues 35%, and Communication Process 25%. Although this paper will not contain complete course outlines and syllabi, the following descriptions should clarify the differences between the courses.

Fundamentals of Speech

The primary goal of the course was to develop a skilled public speaker. It was assumed that many of the factors studied (content, language, organization, delivery, ect.) would transfer to other communication situations. The course was performance centered and traditional in that a variety of types of speaking was emphasized. Students were evaluated on the traditional criteria of speaking with reference to: (1) the speech to inform, (2) group discussion, (3) the speech to convince, (4) the speech to actuate, and (5) oral reading. Students

were given a mid-term and final examination. Written assignments included an outline for each speech.

Instructional materials included the text Communicative Speaking and Listening by Oliver, Zelko, and Holtzman, a syllabus which described each assignment, and a bibliography for additional readings.

Contemporary Issues

The primary goal of the course was to develop a skilled public speaker. It was assumed the factors studied (research and analysis, content, organization, style, delivery, etc.) would transfer to other communication situations. Although the course was performance centered, emphasis was placed on the critical thinking that arises from the research and analysis of contemporary national or international problems. Each student selected a different topic, researched, and developed that topic for the entire quarter. The approach was based on the notion that a superior speaker is one who can analyze critically, select the most potent and relevant subject matter for his task and master the criteria that are normally applied to good speaking. In a typical speech class the student spends considerable time searching for topics and material for various speeches. This procedure has the advantage of determining the ability of a student to apply speech principles and techniques to each new situation. However, it is unlikely that most students will have the time to develop a topic in depth. In addition, a student may be so busy searching for a topic and absorbing new subject matter that he does not maximize the study of techniques. He may not even recognize that he has improved on a particular technique.

The single topic approach would appear to have the merit of focusing on the critical elements involved in the speaking process. A student should be able to realize his progress after each speech as such an approach places priority on creativity and improvement. It must be pointed out that a

student may just learn to give one speech and may not transfer the knowledge to other speech situations. (The last study in this paper attempts to answer that question.) Although we might advise a student to get "involved" with a topic for the best results, the multiple topic approach may interfere with the advice because of a lack of time. With the single topic approach the student must be able to refine his presentation and the teacher must be able to give specific advice about refinement.

This particular course required the student to understand the process of analysis, the finding of issues, and the difference between inquiry and advocacy. The discussion process was utilized to teach the process of inquiry. Each student delivered three speeches on the topic that he had selected and each time a speech was given a different criterion of speaking was emphasized. Students were expected to correct past inadequacies and indicate acquisition of new skills. For the final speech each student drew a topic and was given two days to compose a speech that indicated what he had learned.

Students were evaluated on (1) discussion and a discussion paper, (2) a lecture that analyzed a problem area, (3) two persuasive speeches, (4) an extemporaneous speech, (5) a research folder, (6) "technical plot" outlines that accompanied each speech, and (7) a mid-term and final examination. Each student was expected to keep a set of notes on outside readings and lectures that dealt with specific areas of study. Instructional materials included Communicative Speaking and Listening by Oliver, Zelko, and Holtzman; Semantics and Communication by John C. Condon, and lecture material compiled from a variety of text books.

Communication Process

The purpose of this course was to provide a basis for understanding communication behavior. The major focus of the course was on the process that occurs

when one is speaking, writing, listening, reading, and thinking. It was felt that such knowledge not only led to greater competence in communication skills but to a better understanding of human behavior.

This course utilized the lecture, discussion, and case study methods. Students were expected to master the lecture material and apply it to case studies. Students were evaluated on (1) Three discussions which applied communication principles to case studies, (2) Three papers which applied communication principles to case studies, and (3) Two examinations over text and lecture materials.

Instructional materials included, The Process of Communication by David K. Berlo, Communication and Organizational Behavior by William V. Haney, and selected bibliography.

Convocations

Special lectures were available to the students in all three courses. These sessions were held once a week and attendance was on a voluntary basis. The lectures were a special service offered to students who wished to (1) hear other instructors, (2) supplement their knowledge, and (3) ask questions of other instructors.

In-Service Training

A seminar for the teachers of each course was held once a week. The three separate seminars were directed at achieving the following objectives: (1) to enrich what was done in the classroom by compiling material for the purpose of supplementing past experience and text materials, (2) to share common problems and experiences that occurred in the classroom, (3) to examine the various methods of teaching the content and achieving results, and (4) to give each instructor an opportunity to shape the direction of the Speech I program. The seminars produced a wealth of materials that was placed on file for all teachers.

Nature and Purpose of the Study

This paper contains several studies that are aimed at determining the reactions to the courses and the effect that the courses had on the students in terms of communicative abilities. Again, it must be pointed out that communicative ability is defined as speaking ability as measured by the traditional criteria of public speaking. The researchers are well aware that this is a limited view of what communicative ability is. However, this seemed the logical place to start considering the lack of comparative studies of instructional methods. It is also apparent that judgments which utilize such criteria are subjective and are really directed toward an artistic standard. The approach used in the study does not deny the value of the "behavioral objective" method nor does it ignore the "behavior" of the receiver as being of major importance. The method used suggests that, (1) one's impression of a communication act is an important part of receiver behavior that may lead to other behaviors such as retention of information, and (2) if traditional speaking criteria represent normative behavior, perhaps that is the area that ought to receive initial research.

The research and developmental program extended over a two year period and contains the following phases: (1) A reaction to the program by the department chairmen of the University, (2) An evaluation of the program by the students that included assessments of textbooks, special lectures, courses, and instructors, (3) An intensive evaluation of teaching methods by students, and (4) An experimental study designed to compare course effectiveness in terms of Communicative ability as measured by traditional Speech criteria.

Although the program at the University of Utah is different from others and the evaluation procedures in these studies are different, there are studies that are relevant. Because space does not permit an extensive review, a number

of these studies are included in the "relevant bibliography" section of this paper. The authors do not wish to convey the impression that valuable studies are not in existence. It is our hope that we can add to a growing body of knowledge.

II. SURVEY OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

Rationale

Because basic communication courses are typically service courses, it was felt that it would be valuable to launch an information campaign concerning the variations and at the same time obtain suggestions from the various departments. In addition information could be obtained that would indicate the image of the past Speech I program.

Method

A booklet was prepared for 69 department chairmen. The booklet included a summary of program innovations for 1968-69, a description of the Speech I program for 1968-69, course outlines for each course in the program, a detailed description of the in-service training program for teaching assistants, description of the special lectures, and a summary of the student evaluations of the 1967-68 Speech I program. The booklet contained a cover letter and a response form.

Results

A total of 60 questionnaires were returned. It should be kept in mind that many of the departments were highly specialized, some were concerned with graduate programs only, and some were quite small. The format of the survey (one page in length) is utilized to report the results.

Speech I Program Response Form

1. We will recommend a Speech I class for our students 31
2. We will require a Speech I class for our students 5
3. We will neither require nor recommend a Speech I class for our students 4
4. Does not apply to this department (graduate program only etc.) 16
5. No commitment 4
6. If we recommended or require a Speech I class for our students, we would prefer:
 A performance-oriented course 17
 A communication-theory oriented course 11

Both Courses 8

7. We would like more data before a decision is made 2
8. Comments: (the following comments were the most frequent)
 - a. Recommend for "some" of our students
 - b. Will recommend for the verbally weak
 - c. We evaluate our students in seminars
 - d. Our students get this practice in class
 - e. We will leave it up to the student
 - f. This will be left to individual counselors
 - g. Speech and English should be combined
 - h. Speech is a part of English
 - i. What about the experience and quality of staff for each course
 - j. Both types of courses should be of value
 - k. Too many hours required of our majors
 - l. A course in which important current issues are critically analyzed is important
 - m. Your program seems to be a step forward
 - n. Although we just have a graduate program, I am committed to requiring Speech I of all
 - o. We would like more information

Conclusions

The responses to the major questions are revealing in that few departments are willing to require a student to take a Speech I course. This is consistent with the trend of letting a student make his own decisions and design his own program. Some chairmen were even unwilling to recommend because they felt students should make such decisions. Because the basic speech course has been thought of as a performance course, it was surprising to see the amount of support for a theory oriented course only. The amount of support for both types

of courses was both surprising and gratifying. Apparently the distinctions between the courses were clear.

The most revealing part of the survey occurred in the written comments of the respondents. It is clear that many of the chairmen felt that (1) Speech I was a remedial class for the verbally weak, (2) Students could achieve the same objectives in other classes by simply practicing, (3) the same objectives are accomplished by other disciplines, (4) Although the new variations were good, teaching assistants may not be able to achieve classroom goals, and (5) The new variations strengthened the program.

The purpose of this study is not to refute the various notions offered by department chairman and their personnel. The survey was valuable in that it revealed the "remedial" image that a number of colleagues had concerning a basic speech program. Such information helps a department of speech to examine itself and make distinctions between what is remedial and what helps the student achieve a professional competence in communication skills. In addition it places the burden of supplying well qualified and trained teachers where it belongs --- directly on the department.

III. STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE SPEECH I COURSES

The major purpose of this study was to obtain specific student reactions to all aspects of the program offered. It should be noted that student evaluation represents only one dimension of course effectiveness. In other words, course work and texts may do more for students than they are willing or able to admit.

Method

Immediately following the final exam during the fall quarter of 1968, each student was asked to fill out an evaluation form. Students were directed to write their test number on the evaluation form and on the answer sheet of their test. The fact that no instructor would ever see any individual response form was explained to the students. Students were also reminded that the evaluation forms would not be tabulated until the next quarter and could in no way affect the final grade. Each instructor asked one of the students to gather the evaluation forms, seal them in an envelope, and return them to the director of the basic courses. This individual did not teach any of the courses. Even with all the effort to provide anonymity for the students, many declined to place a test number on the evaluation sheet as well as the answer sheet of the test. Therefore the data is not as complete as it might be. However, an examination of the forms that were not numbered reveals no atypical responses.

The following reporting method contains the questions asked and the format employed.

General Findings

Student Reactions to Textbooks

TABLE I

TEXTBOOKS	COURSE		COURSE		COURSE	
	Fundamentals of Speech		Contemporary Issues		Communication Process	
Directions: Rate the books that your class uses in the following 1-7 scale. 1 (poor) to 7 (superior). Circle the number that typifies your general reaction.	Mean Score	Mode	Mean Score	Mode	Mean Score	Mode
1. <u>Communicative Speaking and Listening</u> : Oliver, Zelko, and Holtzman.	3.44	4	3.8	4		
2. <u>Semantics and Communication</u> : John C. Condon.			4.63	5		
3. <u>The Process of Communication</u> : David K. Berlo.					4.2	3
4. <u>Communication and Organizational Behavior</u> : William Haney.					5.45	6

Although only two of the texts received much more than average approval, it must be kept in mind that this may be due to the way the text is used rather than the text itself. The texts that seemed to receive the best response were those that used a narrowed view of communication. The books by Condon and Haney are "general semantics" oriented, and develop central themes from that point of view. Students respond well to the concrete style and examples in these books. The other texts cover a variety of themes and tend to be more abstract. They require more "teaching" and interesting examples must come from the teacher. Most textbook authors that write for the beginning course have a tendency to cover a great many variables and communication forms. Therefore the books are loaded with terms that are intended to convey a considerable amount of subject matter very efficiently. This does not make for the easiest reading.

Student Reactions to Special Lectures

TABLE 2

Convocations	Course		Course		Course	
Directions: If you did not attend, circle "0". If you attended, rate 1 (useless) to 7 (very valuable). Circle the number that typifies your general reaction.	Fundamentals of Speech		Contemporary Issues		Communication Process	
	Mean Score	Mode	Mean Score	Mode	Mean Score	Mode
1. Beginning Steps	5.40	6	5.27	6	5.06	7
2. Organization	4.46	5	4.75	5	4.30	5
3. Decision Making	4.95	5	4.38	5	4.10	5
4. Supporting Material	4.59	5	4.62	5	4.45	5
5. Persuasion	4.76	5	4.85	5	5.20	5
6. Transfer of Information	4.70	5	4.57	5	4.50	5
7. Oral Interpretation	5.16	5	4.88	4	4.83	5
8. Radio - TV	3.90	5	4.83	6	4.70	4
9. Speech Pathology	4.87	5	5.00	7	4.12	4
Average Number of Convocations Attended	4.71		4.83		3.9	

It is clear from the above table that the students in the "communication process" course were less inclined to attend the special lectures. Students comments indicated that they felt the lectures were more directed at speaking skills than at the broader aspects of communication.

Although an attendance record of 100% would be most desirable, the average number of lectures attended on a voluntary basis was satisfying. In addition, the ratings for the lectures were generally good.

Student Reactions to the Course

TABLE 3

	Fundamentals of Speech		Contemporary Issues		Communication Process	
Directions: Circle the number that typifies your general re- action to each question on a 1-7 scale. (Not at all sig- nificantly)	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode
1. I believe that my ability to communicate has improved:	5.14	5-6	4.96	5	4.76	5
2. In terms of my confidence about communication, I have gained:	4.78	5	4.79	5	5.56	6
3. In terms of my confidence to communicate I have improved:	5.10	6	4.84	6	4.40	4
4. In terms of critical listen- ing I believe this course has helped me:	4.53	4	4.41	5	5.00	4
5. I believe that this course has helped me understand the communication process:	4.72	5	4.71	5	5.70	6
6. I believe that this course has helped me understand human behavior:	4.00	4	3.97	4	5.30	5
7. In terms of future profession I believe that this course will help me:	5.00	6	4.91	6	5.40	6-7
8. This course is: very easy 1-7 very challenging	5.00	5	5.07	5	5.00	5
Total Evaluation of Course						
Directions: Based on your exper- ience and the material in this questionnaire, please grade this course, as taught, on the foll- owing scale. Circle the app- ropriate letter. 4-A- Excellent 3-B- Good 2-C- Average 1-D- Inferior 0-E- Should be eliminated						
RESULT	2.89	3	2.59	3	3.04	3

One should be careful about drawing inferences from descriptive data, however, the figures in table 3 prompt several tentative conclusions. The overall conclusion is that student reactions reveal basic differences in the courses. It seems that (1) the communication process course provides more information about communication than the performance course, (2) students achieve a feeling of more confidence about communicating after taking the performance courses than the theory course, (3) students feel they have a greater understanding of the communication process after the theory course than after the performance courses, (4) students who enrolled in the communication process course felt they had a greater understanding of human behavior than those who were in the performance courses, (5) the students in the communication process course felt that the course was more relevant to a future profession than the students in the "speaking" courses, and (6) the communication process course received higher overall ratings than the other two courses. Although the contemporary issues course was rated as being slightly more challenging, it was rated lower than the other two courses.

On the basis of student reactions it would seem that the question of which course was superior is not an answerable one, because all of the criteria are important. It seems more sensible to ask if all of these criteria can be built into a single course.

Student Reactions toward the Instructors

TABLE 4

Course	Fundamentals of Speech		Contemporary Issues		Communication Process	
	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode
Directions: Circle the number on the 1-7 scale that typifies your general reaction.						
1. The instructor knows the subject matter: not at all 1-7 extremely well	6.0	7	5.81	6	6.0	6-7
2. The instructor explains the subject matter not at all 1-7 extremely well	5.2	6	5.02	6	5.7	6
3. In terms of organization and preparation: very poor 1-7 superior	5.3	6	4.96	6	5.6	6
4. This instructor handles criticism: very poorly 1-7 very well	5.1	6	5.21	6	5.8	7
5. This instructor's grading system is: very easy 1-7 very hard	5.0	4	4.96	5	4.7	4
6. Does this instructor present a challenging course? not at all 1-7 very much so	5.2	6	5.28	5	5.3	5
7. This instructor takes a great interest in his students: not at all 1-7 very much so	5.53	7	5.28	6	5.6	7
8. I was able to obtain assistance outside of class: not at all 1-7 very much so.	4.50	4	4.70	4	5.37	7
9. This instructor supplements text material: not at all 1-7 very much so	4.25	5	4.24	4-5	4.89	6

The data in the above table were utilized to plan teacher training seminars for the winter quarter of 1969. It was clear that more should be done to supplement course material in all the courses. Grading systems were examined more closely and efforts were made to provide students with more assistance outside of class.

Specific Analysis of Student Reactions

Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Course Evaluation

TABLE 5

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS OF REACTIONS
TO THE INSTRUCTOR AND OVERALL EVALUATION
OF THE COURSE BY EACH STUDENT

Questions rated on a 1-7 scale	Fundamentals of Speech	Contemporary Issues	Communication Process
1. The instructor knows the subject matter.	.411	.513	.455
2. The instructor explains the subject matter.	.202	.298	.508
3. In terms of organization and preparation:	.486	.484	.432
4. The instructor handles criticism:	.333	.568	.520
5. This instructor's grading system is:	.347	.116	.171
6. Does this instructor present a challenging course?	.563	.519	.593
7. This instructor takes a great interest in his students.	.503	.426	.455
8. I was able to obtain assistance outside of class.	.434	.240	.236
9. This instructor supplements text material.	.424	.240	.548

Perhaps the most important conclusion to be drawn from the data in table 5 is that although the correlations are of the moderate variety some of the categories show a consistency across the courses. In other words the data indicates that one has the best chance of predicting how a student will react toward a course by knowing if he believes that (1) the instructor knows the subject matter, (2) the instructor is organized and prepared, (3) the instructor presents a challenging course, and (4) the instructor takes a great interest in his students.

The least predictive item in this study seems to be the instructor's "difficulty of grading. This particular question does not ask about the fairness of the grading procedure. A question worded in that way would probably produce a different response.

Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Class Grade Average

A Pearson Product Moment Correlation between mean ratings of the instructor and the grade average for that instructor's classes produces a figure of .07. It would appear that grades were not a factor in the rating of instructors.

Relationship of Course Ratings and Students Final Grades

It is not uncommon to hear the assertion that students rate a course high if they receive a high grade and low if they receive a low grade. Another assertion is that the poor student likes the speech course because it guarantees a high grade.

The correlation of low course ratings (D or E) and final grades of the students rating the course low was .41. An examination of the grades reveals 9% A's, 38% B's, and 53% C's. The correlation between low course evaluation and grade point averages of the students making those evaluations was .25. It is interesting to note that 32% of those rating the course low had g.p.a.'s of over 3 (on a 4 point scale) and 26% had g.p.a.'s of under 2.

An analysis of high course ratings (A) and the final grade of the students rating the course "excellent," reveals that the students received 22% A's, 48% B's, 27% C's and 2% D's. Students who rated the course excellent (A) had grade point averages of 24% - 3pt. and above, 51% - 2pt. and above, and 24% - below a 2pt. average.

It seems clear that one can not "type" a student because he rates a course high or low and one can not assert that only the mediocre student seeks out a speech course. However, there was a moderate correlation between course evaluation and student grades in two of the courses. An analysis of the Fundamentals

course resulted in a correlation of .66 between course ratings and students final grades. The correlation for the course rating and students final grade in the Communication Process course was .48. The same kind of correlation in the Contemporary Issues course was .12. It is difficult to determine if one achieves a high grade in a course because he likes that course or if one likes the course because he is achieving. The correlation in the contemporary issues course tends to corroborate other data which indicates that students were not pleased with the course even with a high grade.

Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Convocation Attendance

It was assumed by those in the basic courses that a superior instructor would inspire attendance at the special lectures. A correlation between instructor evaluation and average convocation attendance produced a figure of .09. It would seem that students might have been inspired, but not to attend the lectures.

Relationship of Instructor Evaluation and Textbook Evaluation

Although it is difficult to obtain a textbook that makes everyone happy in a large service course, directors of such courses are always hopeful that instructors will make the text attractive.

TABLE 6

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN AVERAGE
INSTRUCTOR EVALUATIONS AND AVERAGE
TEXTBOOK EVALUATIONS FOR
EACH CLASS

Text	Course	Correlation
<u>Communication Speaking and Listening</u>	Fundamentals	.40
Oliver, Zelko, and Holtzman	Contemporary Issues	.65
<u>Semantics and Communication</u>	Contemporary Issues	.02
John C. Condon		
<u>The Process of Communication</u>	Communication Process	.12
David K. Berlo		
<u>Communication and Organizational Behavior</u>	Communication Process	.09
William Haney		

The correlations in table 6 indicate that there is some relationship between the evaluation of the instructor and the evaluation of the book Communicative Speaking and Listening. This book also received the lowest rating of all the books used. The other correlations suggest that the rest of the texts were evaluated independently of the instructors.

Relationship of Mean Ratings of Instructors and General Course Evaluation

The mean rating of the instructor was determined after eliminating the questions concerning the instructor's grading system and his availability outside of class. A correlation of this rating and the mean rating of overall course evaluations produced a figure of .46. Although this suggests a relationship between instructor evaluation and course evaluation that relationship is not strong.

Relationship of Mean Instructor Ratings and Mean Convocation Ratings

If a student is pleased with an instructor will he also be pleased with the special lectures? A correlation of .13 reveals that there was very little relationship.

Relationship of Mean Course Evaluations and Average Convocation Ratings

If a student rates the course high, will he also tend to rate the special lectures in the same way? A correlation of .19 indicates that the answer is no.

Analysis of Teaching Methods

The 1968 Fall quarter instructors evaluations revealed that only 6 instructors out of 31 had a overall rating of below 5 on a 7 point scale. Only one instructor had a rating of below 4 and two had a rating of over 6. The teachers in the communication process course had consistently higher ratings than the teachers in the other courses. The winter quarter of 1969 was devoted to examining teacher methods and student reactions. An effort was made to improve instruction and to also obtain as much data as possible so that selection of students for the experimental study would account for the teaching variable. At the conclusion of the Winter quarter final examination 749 students filled out a teacher evaluation form. Students were instructed to not sign their name and a student was assigned to pick up the forms and deliver them to the program director's office. The form was developed by the Student Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate at Ohio University in 1965.

Summary of Responses to Teacher Evaluation Forms

The figures in the following summary represent the percentage of responses to each question for each type of course. The key for interpretation is as follows:
CI = Contemporary Issues, CP = Communication Process, and F = Fundamentals.

PART ONE: Questions on Course Content

A. Background and Interest of Instructor

1. Does the instructor possess an adequate background of subject matter for this course?	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. very well informed on subject	64%	73%	74%
b. fairly well informed	33%	24%	24%

c. partially informed on subject	<u>CI</u> 2%	<u>CP</u> 1½%	<u>F</u> ½%
d. uninformed on subject	-	-	-
e. no opinion	1%	1½%	1½%

B. Coordination of Content

2. Does the instructor integrate his subject matter with that of other areas?

This does not mean that the instructor gets off the subject, but that he shows how his subject relates to other disciplines.

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. constantly integrates subject with other areas	15%	26%	15%
b. frequently integrates subject with other areas	35½%	55%	46½%
c. sometimes integrates subject with other areas	20%	16½%	30½%
d. seldom integrates subject with other areas	28½%	2½%	7%
e. never integrates subject with other areas	1%	-	1%

3. Does the instructor use up-to-date material?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. always uses up-to-date material	58%	44%	39%
b. often uses up-to-date material	35%	45%	47%
c. occasionally uses up-to-date material	7%	9%	10%
d. seldom uses up-to-date material	-	2%	3%
e. never uses up-to-date material	-	-	1%

4. Does the instructor supplement the material in the text?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. brought in vast amount of material not found in class	13%	13%	13%
b. often brought in material not found in class	41%	43%	36%
c. sometimes went beyond textbook	31%	32%	33%
d. seldom goes beyond textbook	12%	10%	12%
e. never goes beyond textbook	3%	2%	6%

5. How difficult did you find the textbook? If you were dissatisfied with the text, check those objections applicable.

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. faulty organization	7%	12%	3%
b. uninteresting, when could have been interesting	53%	54%	52%
c. not specific enough, material was chatty	21%	20½%	28%
d. obscure style	16%	2½%	16%
e. out of date	3%	1%	1%

6. Does the instructor make good use of his opportunity to distribute (handout and other) supplementary materials?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. always makes use	9%	28%	6%
b. often makes use	22%	22%	16%
c. occasionally makes use	31%	38%	28%
d. seldom makes use	22%	21%	19%
e. never makes use	16%	11%	29%

C. Coverage and Content

7. Does the instructor dwell upon the obvious?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. dwells on the obvious most of the time	19%	22½%	15%
b. dwells on the obvious some of the time	34%	40%	36%
c. seldom dwells on the obvious	41%	37%	40%
d. never dwells on the obvious	6%	½%	9%

8. Assumming that you met the prerequisites of the course, did the instructor maintain an appropriately challenging level of content?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. appropriately challenging	68%	61%	67%
b. sometimes challenging	21%	23%	19%
c. occasionally challenging	8%	12%	11%
d. never challenging	3%	4%	3%

9. Does the content of the course stimulate original or creative thinking?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. too much aim for original thinking	5%	3%	3%
b. original thinking successfully stimulated	53%	48%	60%
c. some original thinking	26½%	30%	28%
d. little original thinking stimulated	11½%	14%	3½%
e. no original thinking stimulated	4%	5%	5½%

10. Is the "practical" application of the course called to the student's attention?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. practical application continually presented	19%	38%	27%
b. practical application stressed	34%	31½%	31%
c. practical application often mentioned	29%	22%	29%
d. few practical applications given	14%	8%	12½%
e. no practical application given	4%	½%	½%

11. Is the course well organized?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. always organized	41%	38½%	39%
b. usually organized	35%	48½%	49%
c. occasionally organized	10%	11%	8%
d. seldom organized	4%	1%	3½%
e. never organized	-	1%	½%

12. Is the instructor well prepared for class meetings?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. preparation always pertinent to content of course	53%	60%	61%
b. preparation usually pertinent to content of course	38%	35%	32%
c. preparation occasionally pertinent to content of course	5%	3%	5%

d. preparation seldom pertinent to content of course	3%	1½%	1½%
e. preparation never pertinent to content of course	1%	½%	½%

C. Teaching Methods and Techniques

13. Is there a proper balance between lecturing and discussion?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. much too much lecturing	3%	1%	3%
b. somewhat overbalanced in favor of lecturing	11%	8%	12%
c. balanced okay	71%	76%	73%
d. somewhat overbalanced in favor of discussion	13%	13%	10%
e. much too much discussion	1½%	2%	2%

14. Does the instructor use inductive reasoning (dates, examples, illustrations, stories, visual aids, etc.)?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. too frequently uses	1%	2%	1%
b. frequently uses	47%	53%	47%
c. occasionally uses	36%	37%	31%
d. seldom uses	12%	7%	16%
e. never uses	4%	1%	5%

15. How are assignments distributed throughout the course?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. too many throughout the course	7%	4%	6%
b. too many at the beginning of the course	1½%	6%	2%
c. too many at the end of the course	7½%	1%	7%
d. too many near examinations	4%	9%	4%
e. proper distribution of assignments	80%	69%	81%

16. Is the instructor proficient in making assignments?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. directions clear and complete	68%	61%	62%
b. directions occasionally vague and unclear	29%	34½%	31%
c. frequently makes indefinite and hurried assignments	3%	4½%	6%
d. frequently gives assignments without notice	-	-	2%

17. Does the instructor require library work?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. too much library work	19½%	1%	3%
b. adequate amount of library work	68%	23%	72%
c. too little library work	3%	1%	3%
d. no library work	3%	32%	9%
e. does not apply to this course	6½%	43%	13%

F. Examinations and Evaluations

18. How many examinations are given in the course?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. too many	10%	-	1%
b. adequate number	79%	84%	82%
c. not enough	11%	16%	11%

19. Are examination questions clearly worded?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. clear and understandable	38%	39%	50%
b. difficult to understand	14%	8%	7%
c. sometimes not clear	33%	34%	29%
d. frequently ambiguous and involved	15%	19%	14%

20. Are the examinations "fair" to the student?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. too long	11%	9½%	4%

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
b. too short	1%	1%	1%
c. adequate sampling	62%	77%	79%
d. too easy	1%	1%	1%
e. too difficult	25%	11½%	15%
21. <u>Is the instructor's grading "fair" to the student?</u>			
	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. tends to type a student	16%	13%	23½%
b. tends to resent opposing views	7%	7%	15%
c. tends to be biased toward certain students	9%	8%	13%
d. tends to be influenced by "apple-polishing"	4%	6%	4%
e. tends to use a Bell curve	15%	34½%	20%
f. declines to give "A's"	49%	31½%	24½%
22. <u>What is the basis for the term grade?</u>			
	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. major material adequately covered by tests	14%	32½%	11%
b. adequate credit for classroom discussion	20%	32½%	24%
c. adequate credit for course projects	48%	21%	52%
d. based on too few tests	7%	4%	5%
e. based wholly on tests	1%	2%	2%
f. considers class attendance	10%	8%	6%
23. <u>Do the students feel free to ask questions, to disagree, and to express their ideas?</u>			
	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. encourages student ideas	68%	84%	59%
b. highly tolerant of student ideas	9%	10%	12%

c. tolerant of student ideas	18%	14%	20%
d. intolerant of student ideas	4%	1%	6%
e. discourages student ideas	1%	1%	3%

24. Does the instructor suffer from any of these voice problems?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. nasality	14%	33%	12½%
b. mumbling			
c. pitch problems			
1. too high	43%		50%
2. too low			
3. lacks variety	17%		12½%
4. monotonous patterns			12½%
d. too soft to be heard	-	-	12½%
e. too loud	-	-	-
f. generally uncontrolled	-	-	-
g. too severe foreign accent	14%	-	-

25. How do you rate the instructor's vocabulary?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. too much professional jargon	2%	½%	1%
b. difficult to understand	2%	2%	-
c. usually understandable	30%	34%	26%
d. easily understandable	65%	63%	73%
e. too elementary	1%	½%	½%

26. Is the instructor's delivery free from mannerisms, gestures and peculiarities which are distracting and irritating?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. has none	53%	57%	65½%
b. has some	42%	39%	29%
c. has many	5%	4%	5½%

27. Does the instructor's delivery show enthusiasm?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. over enthusiastic	4%	4%	3%

b. sufficiently enthusiastic	47%	65%	61%
c. average enthusiasm	40%	20%	26%
d. sometimes enthusiastic	7%	9½%	7%
e. never enthusiastic	2%	1½%	3½%

28. Is the instructor neat in appearance?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. overly meticulous	1%	1%	1%
b. always neat in appearance	73%	63%	87%
c. generally neat in appearance	24%	34%	12%
d. seldom neat in appearance	2%	2%	-
e. never neat in appearance	-	-	-

29. Do the instructor's attitudes make him approachable by the students?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. always approachable	48½%	66%	57%
b. usually approachable	42%	29%	33½%
c. seldom approachable	8%	4½%	8%
d. never approachable	1½%	½%	1½%

30. Is the instructor able to lead discussions?

	<u>CI</u>	<u>CP</u>	<u>F</u>
a. overbearing in his leadership	7%	3%	9%
b. excellent leadership	46%	49%	45%
c. usually good leadership	45%	47%	45%
d. seldom good leadership	4%	½%	2%
e. never good leadership	-	½%	-

- 31 What is your general appraisal of the instructor?
Circle the appropriate letter.

Number of responses

	E Failure	D Poor	C Average	B Good	A Excellent
CI	0	7	38	107	85
CP	0	6	15	94	94
F	0	9	43	141	110

Percentage of responses

CI	0%	3%	16%	45%	36%
CP	0%	3%	7%	45%	45%
F	0%	3%	14%	47%	36%

Analysis of Responses to Teacher Evaluation Form

Percentage figures can be misleading, however the following inferences seem justified.

1. The majority of responses toward the instruction was favorable.
2. Much of the reaction toward the textbooks was unfavorable.
3. The contemporary issues course was found to be the most challenging of the courses.
4. Teachers in the communication process course tended to place more emphasis on practical application, although the course was theory oriented.
5. Instructors in the communication process course tended to use more examples and teaching materials than instructors in the other courses. Because much of the other courses is based on performance, teachers probably do not have the time to illustrate and lecture as much.
6. It is clear that the contemporary issues course required more library work and more independent research. Student comments concerning library work corroborate the percentage figures.
7. Students did not react favorably toward the departmental multiple choice exams.
8. The majority of students felt that they were free to ask questions, to disagree, and to express their ideas.
9. An examination of responses toward individual teachers revealed that in several cases a considerable improvement was made over the instructor evaluations of the Fall quarter.

Discussion of Student Evaluations

A review of the findings concerning the instructional materials, the courses, the instructors, and the teaching methods prompts the following comments.

(1) Only two of the texts used received a highly favorable rating. Part of this may be due to the nature of beginning textbooks. Also it is difficult for students to understand the part that a text plays in courses that are performance oriented. This is also true of the examinations given in such courses. Actual performance is of such immediate concern that the notion of conceptualizing future needs and events becomes lost.

(2) Students will attend special lectures on a voluntary basis if they feel that the material is relevant to what they want to learn. The lectures offered to the students were somewhat traditional and did not clearly serve each course. However, a well designed lecture series could serve several courses.

(3) Student reactions to the courses reveals that student behavior may be quite different after each course and that each course serves a particular need. It is doubtful that all of these needs can be met by a single course.

(4) It would seem that reactions to an instructor in a basic communication course is no different from the reactions to an instructor in a different kind of course. The same variables seem to emerge in most studies of teachers. However, one aspect of the communication courses deserves special attention. Communication is a very personal and student centered behavior. This gives an instructor the opportunity to take a great interest in the personal development of the student. Observable behavior modification takes place throughout a course. The way in which an instructor handles criticism and the amount of personal attention he gives to each student becomes extremely important.

(5) Students do not base their rating of instructors and the course rating on the grades received in the course. There is not a particular "type" of student

that rates a course high or low. It is interesting to note that the instructor who gave the highest grades also received the lowest instructor evaluation. This information should be particularly helpful to the teaching assistant.

(6) There is evidence to suggest that the better instructors were able to achieve a higher rating for the least liked textbook in the courses. However, the correlations are only moderate. The same kind of evidence also suggests that there is some relationship between the rating of instructors and the rating of courses.

(7) It would appear that the contemporary issues course was the most challenging, the most demanding, and the least liked. In addition this course was considered the least practical by the students.

Student evaluations are only one dimension of what a course does or does not do. Fall quarter of 1968 had been devoted to obtaining an appraisal of the program by department chairmen, students in the courses, and staff members. Winter quarter of 1969 was spent in an intensive evaluation of teaching methods in the training seminars and by obtaining student responses on a comprehensive teacher evaluation form. During the Spring quarter of 1969 teachers in the courses studied the evaluations of Winter quarter and designed new teaching methods. It was during this time that the last phase of the program evaluation was designed. The program had undergone some refinement and the teachers were more experienced so a study was designed to determine the effects of the three instructional methods on student behavior.

IV AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF
THREE INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS OF SPEAKING
EFFECTIVENESS

The fourth study of the research program was intended to compare course effectiveness in terms of communicative ability as measured by traditional speech criteria. Although a rationale for this approach and course descriptions are stated in the introduction of the paper, a brief review might be helpful to the reader.

Nature of the Study

Definition of Terms

In this study "speaking effectiveness" is defined as the score a student received on a rating form that emphasized traditional speech criteria. Students received scores from professional expert judges and from professional non-expert judges. The criteria for the selection of judges is explained in a following section. Comparative effects were determined by comparing the scores given to each student by the judges.

Recent studies have investigated the relationship between traditional speech evaluation scales and communicator goals such as audience comprehension and persuasion. (See Barker, Kibler, and Geter "Two Investigations of the Relationship Among Selected Ratings of Speech Effectiveness and Comprehension," also Gruner, Gruner, and Olson "Is Classroom Evaluation Related to Actual Effectiveness of Classroom Speeches?" Listed in Appendix 1) It is clear that "speaking effectiveness" has a number of dimensions. Some argue that typical speech-rating scales appear to measure a speech's approximation to the classical model, not its probable effect upon an audience. (See Samuel L. Becker, "Methodological Analysis in Communication Research" Listed in Appendix 1) Because of the differences in experimental manipulations

and the various communicator goals measured, the conclusions of various studies differ. However, it must be pointed out that this study is not referring to communicator goals when the term "speaking effectiveness" is used. Although this may be a limitation, it also allowed us to focus on instructional methods and the reactions of the expert professional and non-expert professional according to a classical or artistic standard.

Previous Studies

Investigators have examined the effect of instructional methods upon achievement in communication skill by varying the way in which the content was taught. Although various criterion measures have been used to determine course outcomes, the content has been largely skill oriented.

This study is a departure in several ways; (1) The instruction varies the way in which the content is taught and in addition the content is different, (2) The subjects for the study were selected on the basis of past training and experience, and (3) Subjects were rated by expert professionals and non-expert professionals.

Distinctions Between Instructional Methods

Approximately 750 students participated in the basic communication program each quarter and each type of course was assigned randomly across course sections --- 40% of the sections were designated as Fundamentals of Speech, 35% Contemporary Issues, and 25% Communication Process.

The major distinctions between the courses are as follows:

- (1) Fundamentals of Speech - The primary goal of the course was to develop a skilled public speaker. The course was performance centered and traditional in that a variety of types of speaking was emphasized. Students were evaluated on the traditional criteria of speaking with reference to: (A) The speech to inform, (B) Group discussion, (C) The speech to convince, (D) The speech to actuate, and (E) Oral reading.

- (2) Contemporary Issues - The primary goal of the course was to develop a skilled public speaker. Although the course was performance centered, emphasis was placed on the research and analysis of contemporary national and international problems. Each student selected a different topic and then developed that topic by research and analysis for the entire quarter. This particular course required the student to understand the process of analysis, the finding of issues and the difference between inquiry and advocacy. The discussion process was utilized to teach the nature of inquiry. Each student delivered three speeches on the topic that he had selected and each time a speech was given a different criterion of speaking was emphasized. At the conclusion of the course each student was assigned a topic and given two days to compose a speech that indicated his ability to research, analyze, and structure. This final assignment was used to determine if the student had just learned to give one speech and if he could adapt the criteria of speaking to a new topic. The emphasis of the course is reflected in the assignments given to students. Students were evaluated on (A) Discussion and a discussion paper, (B) A lecture that analyzed a problem area, (C) Two persuasive speeches, (D) A final extemporaneous speech on a new topic, (E) A research folder, and (F) "Technical plot" outlines that accompanied each speech.
- (3) Communication Process - The primary goal of the course was to provide a basis for understanding communication behavior. The major focus of the course was on the process that occurs when one is speaking, writing, listening, reading, and thinking. The assumption was that such knowledge leads to greater competence in communication skills. The course utilized the lecture, discussion, and case study methods. Students were expected to master the lecture material and apply it to case studies. They were evaluated on (A) Three discussions which applied communication principles to case studies, (B) Three papers which applied communication principles to case studies, and (C) tests over text and lecture materials.

It should be noted that the teachers for each of the courses had undergone an intensive training and evaluation program for an academic year. This was in addition to the previous experience and training that they brought to each course.

Over the period of a quarter nine special lectures were presented as convocations. Attendance was on a voluntary basis. Although the topics were

of a general nature and speakers presented everything from general communication topics to fields of study, two of the sessions were aimed at specific speech criteria. Therefore it is possible that some of the subjects of this study were exposed to material not contained in their particular class. However, there is little doubt about the emphasis of each class.

Limitations of the Study

Speaking effectiveness has a number of dimensions which should be measured by a variety of criterion measures. It would be desirable to measure a variety of situations along with that of public speaking. For example, the interview setting might reveal that one of the courses was superior in helping the interviewer adjust to responses. Perhaps one of the courses helps the student build a better manuscript and is superior in terms of writing skills.

The "behavioral objective" approach has the merit of specifying what behaviors should change in the receiver of the message -- comprehension, recall, acceptance, etc. Although this method seems to be the ultimate test for speaking effectiveness, one should not put aside the traditional criteria of speaking effectiveness that may represent an artistic standard. Why? First of all, because impressions of others do count and such criteria may just represent normative behavior which is expected by the receiver of a message. If expectations are violated communicator goals might be affected. Secondly, the studies that examine the relationship of ratings on traditional scales and communicator goals such as comprehension, utilize a rather select population in an artificial setting and the findings may be quite misleading.

For example, college students may be able to handle poor organization in the traditional sense and still reconstruct and comprehend the message. This may not be true of the general population.

This study represents an examination of some basic questions by utilizing limited criterion measures and a traditional view of speaking effectiveness. Eventually one must determine the relationship of traditional criteria to receiver behavior and not just in terms of communicator goals. In addition, if speech education is to achieve potency, it would be desirable to determine just how much difference in communicator skill makes a difference in receiver behavior. The authors have not ignored such issues but have utilized the time and money available to build a foundation for exploring those issues in future studies.

Experimental Questions

1. Does the one quarter course in communication affect the speaking behavior of students?
2. Does the efficiency of a course (Contemporary Issues) teach students to give one speech well and thereby detract from development of general skill?
3. Can students speak as well after a course in communication theory (Communication Process) which excludes specific speech theory and practice?
4. Is there a difference in how expert professional judges and non-expert professional judges view speech criteria?
5. Do the attitudes of students tend to be corroborated by objective evidence? (Is there a relationship between the liking of a course and the students performance?)
6. What kind of judge reliability does one get with four different conditions? (Three instructional methods and a control group.)

Method

Selection of Subjects

Students were selected from the classes of teaching assistants.

A number of measurements had been made on each instructor's teaching ability and we were able to select students that had received the best instruction available. Only the top rated instructors provided students for the study. This procedure was used to cancel out instructor "effects." In addition, the utilization of the teaching assistants allowed for more control of the experiment.

Students filled out a "speech information form" which attempted to assess previous speech contest activity, previous classroom speech activity, church activity, previous speech classes, previous drama classes, and organizational activity. (See Appendix 2) The information on the form revealed that a substantial number of students had very little if any previous speaking experience or training. This group constituted a population from which a random sample was drawn. A total of 30 students was drawn from each group of classes that represented a different instructional method. A group of 30 students was used as a control group. Because one student did not appear for the assigned task, the total number of students involved in the experiment was 119.

Experimental Design

A post test design was used to determine the effect of the instructional methods. The experiment was conducted at the conclusion of a quarter of instruction. Then the groups were compared on the assumption that a random selection of students had removed the probability that any one group was atypical of the rest. The control group was comprised of students that were in their first week of instruction during a following quarter. These students were selected on the same basis as the experimental groups and

followed the same procedures without the benefit of a quarter of instruction. An analysis of variance procedure was used to compare the groups in terms of course type and speech criteria.

Selection of Judges

Two types of professional judges were utilized in the study. The "expert professional" judge was an individual who held at least a M.A. degree in speech and had considerable teaching experience. Judges were selected from other institutions so that training bias or specific knowledge of a student would not be factors in the ratings. Three "expert professional" judges took part in the experiment.

The "non-expert professional" judge was an individual who was a professional person with considerable experience in working with people, was considered to be an excellent communicator in his profession, and who had little or no training in speech skills. Three "non-expert professional" judges consisted of a realtor, a psychologist, and a production manager who was also responsible for a management training program.

Procedure

Instructions to Teachers

Instructions to the participating instructors emphasized the importance of (1) providing motivation for students to do their best, (2) maintaining a positive attitude toward the required task, and (3) not leaking information about the project until all students involved had approximately the same time to prepare. (See Appendix 3 for complete instructions.)

All instructors received a final list of all students involved and the time that they were to participate. They were asked to remind the students and verify time and place. A third and final set of instructions asked

each teacher to obtain a commitment from each student participating.

Instructions to Students

Students were told that the quality of their participation in the project would be considered by their teachers. Each student was given two days to prepare a five minute talk which was placed on video-tape. Students were allowed to select a topic from a list of ten which were worded in such a way that the student was required to take a position on a contemporary question of controversy. The student was required to select a topic which he had not used previously for a formal presentation. Students were allowed to use one card for reference notes and were allowed to speak for a maximum of five minutes. (See Appendix 4 for complete instructions.)

Instrumentation

Students were rated on a form which included the criterion categories of content, choice and use of words, organization, delivery, and general effectiveness. Each criterion was accompanied by a description and the rating scale contained descriptive terms. In addition all speakers were ranked in their particular group. (See Appendix 5 for rating form.)

Each student was assigned a number (including students in the control group) and the numbers were distributed randomly to comprise speaking groups for each video-tape. Blank spaces were left in the tape so that control group members could be inserted at a later date. This procedure was carried out so that order effects would not distort the outcome.

Instructions to TV operators emphasized standardization of procedure as did the instructions to timers. (See Appendix 6 for instructions to TV operators and timers.)

Instruction to Judges

The judges were instructed on the mechanics of filling out the rating forms and were supplied with a sample form that was filled out with hypothetical data. Judges were also supplied with the instructions that had been given to the students. (See Appendix 7 for directions to judges.)

Results and Analysis

A Cochrans test and a Bartlett's test for homogeneity of variance revealed that the groups were not significantly different from one another and they appeared to belong to the same population.

The data was analyzed by using an analysis of variance procedure for each criterion of measurement that appeared on the rating forms. The following tables contain the results. Students were rated on 1-5 scale where 1= poor, 5= superior.

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RATINGS GIVEN BY EXPERT AND NON-EXPERT
JUDGES TO STUDENTS ON THE CRITERION OF CONTENT AND
MEAN RATINGS FOR COURSES AND JUDGES

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F-ratio	Significance Level
Judges	1	5.73	5.73	6.04	.01
Course	3	37.75	12.58	13.30	.001
Interaction	3	8.89	2.96	3.12	.02
Subtotal	7	52.38			
Error	706	670.46	.94		
Total	713	722.85			

Mean Ratings for Each Course

Communication Process	2.54
Fundamentals	2.96
Contemporary Issues	2.91
Control Group	2.43

Mean Ratings by Judges

Expert Professional	2.80
Non-expert Professional	2.62

The results indicate that on the criterion of content: (1) The difference in judging was significant, (2) The differences in course instruction were significant, (3) There was a significant interaction effect between the judging and the students judged from various courses, (4) The rank order of courses according to ratings received (highest to lowest) was Fundamentals, Contemporary Issues, Communication Process, and control group, and (5) The expert professional judge tended to rate the students higher than the non-expert professional.

The Newman-Keuls test (see Winer in bibliography) was applied to determine the specific areas of difference and the .05 level was required for statistical significance. On the criterion of content the fundamentals and issues groups were not significantly different. However they were significantly different from the communication and control groups. The communication group was not significantly different from the control group. An analysis of the interaction effect revealed that expert judges ratings of the fundamentals and issues groups were significantly different from those of the non-expert judges. The expert judge tended to rate the fundamentals and issues groups higher.

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RATINGS GIVEN BY EXPERT
AND NON-EXPERT JUDGES TO STUDENTS ON THE
CRITERION OF LANGUAGE AND MEAN RATINGS
FOR COURSES AND JUDGES

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F-ratio	Significance Level
Judges	1	.35	.35	.48	N.S
Course	3	14.07	4.96	6.31	.001
Interaction	3	3.10	1.03	1.39	N.S
Subtotal	7	17.53			
Error	706	525.07	.74		
Total	713	542.61			

Mean Ratings for Each Course

Communication Process	2.59
Fundamentals	2.81
Contemporary Issues	2.80
Control Group	2.48

Mean Ratings by Judges

Expert Professional	2.69
Non-Expert Professional	2.65

The results indicate that on the criterion of language: (1) the differences between the courses were significant, (2) the rank order of courses according to ratings received (highest to lowest) was Fundamentals,

Contemporary Issues, Communication Process, and Control Group, and (3) the expert judges rated the student slightly higher than the non-expert.

A Newman-Keuls application revealed that both the fundamentals and issues groups were significantly different from the control group, but the communication group was not significantly different from the control group.

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RATINGS GIVEN BY EXPERT
AND NON-EXPERT JUDGES TO STUDENTS ON THE
CRITERION OF ORGANIZATION AND MEAN
RATINGS FOR COURSES AND JUDGES

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F-ratio	Significance Level
Judges	1	5.04	5.04	5.76	.02
Course	3	30.16	10.05	11.50	.001
Interaction	3	2.09	.69	.79	N.S
Subtotal	7	37.30			
Error	706	618.35	.87		
Total	713	655.66			

Mean Ratings for Each Course

Communication Process	2.40
Fundamentals	2.81
Contemporary Issues	2.70
Control Group	2.32

Mean Ratings by Judges

Expert Professional	2.47
Non-expert Professional	2.64

The results of the variance test indicate that on the criterion of organization: (1) The differences between the courses and the differences between judges were significant, (2) The rank order of courses according to

ratings received (highest to lowest) was Fundamentals, Issues, Communication Process, and Control Group, and (3) The non-expert judges rated students higher.

The Newman-Keuls test revealed that ratings for the fundamentals and issues groups were significantly different from the other groups. The communication group was not significantly different from the control group. The fundamentals and issues groups were not significantly different. The non-expert judges were different from the expert in that they gave higher ratings.

TABLE 10
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF RATINGS GIVEN BY EXPERT
AND NON-EXPERT JUDGES TO STUDENTS ON THE
CRITERION OF DELIVERY AND MEAN RATINGS
FOR COURSES AND JUDGES

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F-ratio	Significance Level
Judges	1	2.83	2.83	3.70	.05
Course	3	11.80	3.93	5.13	.01
Interaction	3	1.59	.53	.69	N.S.
Subtotal	7	16.23			
Error	706	541.46	.76		
Total	713	557.69			

Mean Ratings for Each Course

Communication Process	2.30
Fundamentals	2.58
Contemporary Issues	2.59
Control Group	2.37

Mean Ratings by Judges

Expert Professional	2.40
Non-expert professional	2.52

The results of the variance procedure suggested that on the criterion of delivery: (1) Differences between judges and the differences between courses were significant, (2) The rank order of courses according to ratings received (highest to lowest) was Contemporary Issues, Fundamentals, Control Group, and Communication Process, and (3) Non-experts tended to judge slightly higher than experts.

Application of the Newman-Kuels test produced no specific significant differences. Because of the apparent anomaly, t tests were applied. The only comparison that approached significance was that between the Issues group and the Communication Process group. The figure was significant at the .06 level. Apparently the variance was distributed somewhat equally throughout the sample.

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE RATINGS GIVEN BY EXPERT
AND NON-EXPERT JUDGES TO STUDENTS ON THE
CRITERION OF GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS AND
MEAN RATINGS FOR COURSES AND JUDGES

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F-ratio	Significance Level
Judges	1	2.71	2.71	3.41	N.S.
Course	3	22.70	7.56	9.53	.001
Interaction	3	3.94	1.31	1.65	N.S.
Subtotal	7	29.36			
Error	706	561.02	.79		
Total	713	590.38			

Mean Ratings for Each Course

Communication Process	2.34
Fundamentals	2.70
Contemporary Issues	2.67
Control Group	2.32

Mean Ratings by Judges

Expert Professional	2.45
Non-Expert Professional	2.57

The results of the variance test on the criterion of general effectiveness indicated that the difference between courses was significant. Although the difference between judges was not significant, the figure would have been significant if the .06 level was considered. The rank order of courses according to rating received (highest to lowest) was Fundamentals, Contemporary Issues, Communication Process, and Control Group. Non-experts tended to rate slightly higher than experts on this criterion.

Specific analysis with the Newman-Kuels test revealed that both the Fundamentals and Issues groups were significantly different from the communication and control groups. The communication group was not significantly different from the control group.

Analysis of Speaker Ranks

An analysis of variance was applied to the ranks of each speaker for each course. The rankings achieved by the Issues and Fundamentals groups were significantly different from the rankings obtained by the control group. In terms of mean rankings for each group (from lowest to highest) the following figures resulted -- Contemporary Issues 4.32, Fundamentals 4.50, Communication Process 4.89, and Control Group 5.44. This data indicates that those in the Issues and Fundamental groups were ranked consistently higher than those in the other groups.

Analysis of Topic Selection

Because students had a choice of topics from a list of ten and because it was possible that judges reacted to the subject matter of a message as well as its treatment, an analysis was made of general effectiveness scores and topic selection. A Chi Square analysis revealed that (1) Ratings on general effectiveness seem related to the topic chosen by the subjects. The Chi Square value was significant at the .001 level. Therefore it can not be concluded that the ratings were independent from the topic. (2) A subsequent analysis of topics and groups revealed that it is probable that the choice of topic was independent from the group in which the subject appeared. In other words, it can be argued that the results of the study were not contaminated by topics - rating dependence.

Judge Reliability

The Ebel formula for computing reliability coefficients (see Guilford in bibliography) was utilized to determine the reliability between all six judges on each criterion of measurement. The analysis was based on a random sample of speakers. Twenty speakers were chosen by utilizing a table of random numbers. This amounted to a total of 120 individual ratings on each problem (20 speeches x 6 judges). The results were as follows: (1) Content, .87, (2) Language, .86, (3) Organization, .89, (4) Delivery, .90, and (5) General Effectiveness, .90.

Discussion and Conclusions

Does the one quarter course in communication affect the speaking behavior of students? Students in the Fundamentals and Contemporary Issues courses received significantly higher ratings on the criteria of content, language, organization, and general effectiveness than those in a control group who had not benefited from instruction. This was not true on the criterion of delivery. It would appear that judgment on this criterion was quite individualized. The rank order of courses according to mean ratings was Fundamentals, Contemporary Issues, Communication Process, and Control Group on all criteria with the exception of delivery. On the delivery criterion the order was Contemporary Issues, Fundamentals, Control Group, and Communication Process. It would seem that if any criterion would appear different after a quarter of instruction it would be delivery by virtue of practice. However, the nature of the task may have distorted the outcome. The analysis of speaker ranks also support the notion that the course does indeed affect speaking behavior.

Does the efficiency of the Contemporary Issues course teach students to give one speech well and detract from development of general skill? The results indicate that the answer is no. The ratings for the Issues course were not significantly different from the Fundamentals course and both courses had ratings that were significantly different from the other groups. The Fundamentals course was ranked ahead of the Contemporary Issues on the basis of mean ratings on each criterion with the exception of delivery. An examination of the ranks received by each course placed Contemporary Issues in the top position. The results provide evidence for adopting such a course if it offers advantages over traditional procedures.

Can students speak as well after a course in communication theory which excludes speech theory and practice? The evidence of this study says no. The Communication Process group was not significantly different from the control group on any of the criterion measures. However, on the basis of mean ratings and on the basis of rankings, students in the Communication Process course did rank ahead of the control group. It is important to keep in mind that the definition of speaking effectiveness is a limited one. The result does not say that the communication group did not learn anything but rather that the group probably learned something quite different.

Is there a difference in how expert professional judges and non-expert professional judges view speech criteria? With the exception of the criterion of content, the ratings of the expert and non-expert judges were not significantly different. In the case of content, experts ratings were significantly different on the Fundamentals and Issues groups. The experts tended to rate these groups higher on the content criterion. The difference may be due to

expectations that each type of judge held. Expert judges may have certain normative behaviors in mind for a specific criterion while the non-expert may make a more global judgment. Although experts tended to judge language slightly higher and non-experts tended to judge organization, delivery, and general effectiveness slightly higher, the differences were not statistically significant. It is possible that the two types of judges viewed the criteria differently and still judged essentially the same. The important point is that course training apparently had an effect.

Do the attitudes of students tend to be corroborated by objective evidence? A previous study in this paper revealed that students tended to rate the Contemporary Issues course lower than the others. The performance of students in that course indicate that the liking of a course is not related to the benefits of such a course.

What kind of judge reliability does one get with four different conditions? The reliability figure that resulted from the Ebel formula revealed that the six judges were substantially consistent and in considerable agreement across three instructional methods and one control group. A topic selection analysis revealed that judge ratings may not have been independent from the topic chosen by a student, however the choice of topic was independent from the experimental group in which the subject appeared. It can be concluded that judges were consistent in their ratings and that results were not contaminated by topics-rating dependence.

It is clear that the instructional methods had an impact on both expert and non-expert judges in terms of traditional speech criteria. The study does not demonstrate a specific effect on an audience. Are traditional speech criteria related to the expectations of the audience? What communica-

tor goals are related to traditional speech criteria if any? What tasks are best performed by those who study broad communication theory? Do students who have had previous speech training in high school benefit significantly from further course work? What quality of speaking has an effect on communicator goals? This study has provided a base for future studies that will deal with these questions.

APPENDIX 1

RELEVANT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Guilford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. 2nd ed. New York; McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles In Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Articles and Periodicals

- Baker, Eldon E. "Aligning Speech Evaluation and Behavioral Objectives" The Speech Teacher, 16, 1967.
- Barker, Larry L., Kibler, Robert J., and Geter, Ruldolph W. "Two Investigations of the Relationship Among Selected Ratings of Speech Effectiveness and Comprehension," Speech Monographs, 35, 1968.
- Becker, Samuel L., "Rating of Speeches: Scale Independence," Speech Monographs, 29, 1962.
- Becker, Samuel L., and Dallinger, Carl A. "The Effect of Instructional Methods Upon Achievement and Attitudes in Communication Skill," Speech Monographs, 27, 1960.
- Borchers, Gladys L. "Speech Without Work?" Quarterly Journal of Speech, 21, 1935.
- Bostrom, Robert N. "Dogmatism, Rigidity, and Rating Behavior," Speech Teacher, 13, 1964.
- Brooks, Keith "The Construction and Testing of a Forced Choice Scale for Measuring Speaking Achievement," Speech Monographs, 24, 1957.
- Clevenger, Theodore "Retest Reliability of Judgments of General Effectiveness in Public Speaking," Western Speech, 26, 1962.
- Clevenger, Theodore "Influence of Scale Complexity on the Reliability of Ratings of General Effectiveness in Public Speaking," Speech Monographs, 31, 1964.
- Clevenger, Theodore and Tolch, John C., "The Reliability of Judgments of Acting Performance," Educational Theatre Journal, 14, 1962.
- Ewing, William H. "An Evaluation of the Individual vs. The Group Speaking Method of Teaching the Beginning College Speech Course," Speech Monographs, 11, 1944.
- Freshley, Dwight L. and Richardson, Don "Student Evaluation of Basic Speech Courses," Southern Speech Journal, 34, 1968.
- Gruner, Charles R., Gruner, Marsha W., and Olson, Donald O. "Is Classroom

Evaluation Related to Actual Effectiveness of Classroom Speeches?" Southern Speech Journal, 34, 1968.

Henrikson, E. H. "The Relation Among Knowing a Person, Liking a Person, and Judging Him as a Speaker," Speech Monographs, 7, 1940.

Holley, Donald, D'Angelo, Gary, and Roscoe, John, "The Effects of a First Course in Speech and Related Biographical Variables on Speech Proficiency of Students at Colorado State College," Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 7, 1968.

Holtzman, Pual D., Dunham, Robert E., and Spencer, Richard E. "Direct Assessment of Effectiveness of Student Speakers," Journal of Communication, 16, 1966.

Kibler, Robert J., Kelly, Francis J., Gibson, James W., and Gruner, Charles R. "Predicting Speech Grades From Selected Spoken Language Variables," Southern Speech Journal, 34, 1968.

Markgraf, Bruce "The First Course in Speech," Western Speech, 33, 1969.

Thomas, Gordon L., Thurber, John H., and Gruner, Charles R. "Effects of Previous Training on Achievement in the College Course in Public Speaking," Speech Teacher, 14, 1965.

Thompson, Wayne N. "An Experimental Study of the Accuracy of the Typical Speech Rating Techniques," Speech Monographs, 11, 1944.

Thompson, Wayne N. "A Study of the Characteristics of Student Raters of Public Speaking Performances," Speech Monographs, 13, 1946.

Tiemans, Robert K. "Validation of Informative Speech Ratings by Retention Tests," Speech Teacher, 14, 1965.

Villarreall, Jesse J. "Consistency of Judgments of Voice Quality," Southern Speech Journal, 14, 1949.

Waal, Carla and Richardson, Don "Increasing the Reliability of Judgments of Acting Performance," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 52, 1966.

White, Eugene E., Minnick, Wayne C., VanDusen, Raymon C., and Lewis, Thomas R. "Three Interpretations of the First Course in Speech: A Symposium," Southern Speech Journal, 20, 1954.

Wiseman, Gordon, and Barker, Larry "A Study of Peer Group Evaluation," Southern Speech Journal, 31, 1965.

Unpublished Material

Darnell, Donald "Evaluative Discrimination Capacity and Polarity for 125 Semantic Differential Scales for Each of Three Concepts: Speech, Speaker, and Audience," Paper Presented at the 1967 SAA Convention, Las Angeles.

Frandsen, K. D., Larson, C. E., and Knapp, M. L. "Some Effects of Simultaneous and Sequential Video-Tape Playback and Instructor Comments," Paper presented at the 1967 SAA Convention, Los Angeles.

Gruner, Charles R. "Behavioral Objectives Expected by Teachers of Speech as Criteria for the Grading of Classroom Speeches," Paper presented at the 1967 SAA Convention, Los Angeles.

Hurt, David C. Editor, "Five First Courses in Communication," A compilation of papers written by five individual faculty members at five different schools. Presented at the 1970 International Communication Association Convention, Minneapolis.

Kibler, Robert J. "Developing Behavioral Objectives for Undergraduate Speech Instruction," Paper presented at the 1963 SAA Convention, Denver.

Patton, Bobby R. "Effects of the Beginning Speech Course on Student Attitudes and Abilities," Paper presented at the 1967 SAA Convention, Los Angeles.

APPENDIX 2

SPEECH INFORMATION FORM

Instructions: This survey is being taken to determine the amount of speaking experience and formal instruction that you have had. This form is not going to be evaluated by your instructor. It is going to be returned immediately to the director of Speech I and will in no way be used to assess your grade or class standing. Be as honest and accurate as you can.

Name: _____ (Please Print)
Name of instructor: _____ (Please Print)

Circle the most correct answer.

1. How many speeches have you given in inter-scholastic speech contests?
 1. none
 2. 1-5 speeches
 3. 6-10 speeches
 4. 11-50 speeches
 5. over 50 speeches
2. How many public speeches have you given? Count Sunday School short talks, school class speeches, etc., but not speeches given in forensic competition.
 1. none
 2. 1-5 speeches
 3. 6-10 speeches
 4. 11-50 speeches
 5. over 50 speeches
3. How many speech classes have you taken in junior or senior high school?
 1. none
 2. one
 3. two
 4. three
 5. four
4. How many drama classes have you taken in junior or senior high school?
 1. none
 2. one
 3. two
 4. three
 5. four
5. How many offices have you held in an organization that required you to speak to a group (now or before)?
 1. none
 2. one
 3. two
 4. three
 5. four

APPENDIX 3

Name: _____

To: Instructors Involved in Research Project

You are being asked to assist in a research project that represents a year's work. Each part of the project must be carried out precisely or the entire project will represent a considerable loss of time and money.

Your major role will be to provide motivation for selected students so that they will deliver a five minute speech (on an unfamiliar topic) with approximately two days to prepare. This speech will be placed on video-tape.

The mechanics operate as follows:

1. On Wednesday of May 14, you will ask all of your students to fill out a short form that indicates their past training in speech. (I will give you this form which will only take about five minutes.)
2. The forms will be returned to me on the same Wednesday (May 14). I will draw a random sample from the screened forms.
3. On Friday of May 16, you will be notified concerning the students from your class that will be involved. You will be given a set of instructions to give the student on Monday, May 19. No information should be given to the students prior to the 19th.
4. Important: All of the speeches will be given on Thursday, May 22. The student will be obligated for approximately 10 minutes of his time. Because the taping will take place throughout the day, the time assigned to the student may be in conflict with one of his other classes. In this case, he should ask the permission of the instructor to arrive late or depart early. (I am asking that each student arrive at least five minutes before he gives his speech.)
5. Very important: The attitude that you convey to the student will decide the validity of the project, Please keep the following in mind.
 - A. This should be considered a part of a student's classwork. Let the student know that it is important and that you will recognize his contribution. (A satisfactory level of motivation must be present for all students.)
 - B. Do not pass any negative feelings that you may have about the project to the student. Encourage him to do the best job that he can with the time available. The last minute assignment is made by design, not accident or whimsy.
 - C. All students must be exactly on time and in exact order.
 - D. All students will receive a copy of the results of the study.
 - E. A list of ten topics will be made available for the students from which the student shall select one for a five minute speech.

F. If there are any difficulties notify me at once!

APPENDIX 4

Name : _____

INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS PARTICIPATING
IN SPRING QUARTER RESEARCH PROJECT

- I. You have been selected to participate in a project that is extremely important to the Department of Speech at the University of Utah. Your teacher has been instructed to consider the quality of your participation in the project.
- II. You will have two days to prepare a five minute talk which will be videotaped.
- III. A list of ten topics is included with this list of instructions. You are to select one that you have not used previously for a formal presentation.
- IV. You may use one note card for reference notes. The presentation should be no more than five minutes in length. At the 4 minute - 30 second mark a timer will raise his hand which indicates that you have 30 seconds remaining to conclude your remarks. At the five minute mark the timer will signal you to stop by standing.
- V. Important: Arrive at least five minutes before you are scheduled to speak. Remain quietly outside the door. When it is time for you to speak, a timer will ask you to come in and you will advance to the speaker's stand where you will be given the signal to begin. You will give the number of your topic and begin.
- VI. Important: Your assigned time may conflict with another class. In this event, obtain the permission of the instructor to arrive late or leave the class early. It is extremely important that you adhere to the schedule. Give yourself time to reach the assigned building.
- VII. Your schedule:
 Time:
 Place:

TOPICS

1. What should be done about "Campus Unrest?"
2. Will the Republican Party become the majority party?
3. What is your opinion of the ABM system?
4. Is the "civil rights movement" dead?
5. Was entry into the Viet Nam conflict wise for the U.S.?
6. What should be done about the pollution of the natural environment?
7. Should movies be censored?
8. What means of protest are legitimate?
9. What is your opinion of the "New Morality?"
10. What should be taught in the university?

APPENDIX 5

SPEECH RATING FORM

NAME	TAPE								DATE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
SPEAKERS									
CONTENT: (are the ideas significant, supported by reasoning and evidence)?									
CHOICE & USE OF WORDS (is the language interesting, clear, specific, appropriate)?									
ORGANIZATION: (Is the speech composition clear, interesting, and appropriate)?									
DELIVERY: (does the speaker have a sense of communication? Does he use vocal variety, proper pronunciation, clear articulation, and physical reinforcement?)									
GENERAL EFFECTIVENESS									
TOTAL									
RANK									

DIRECTIONS:

Rate each speaker on the following scale for each criterion.

1- Poor

2- Fair

3- Good

4- Excellent

5- Superior

Assign a number for each criterion.

after all the speakers have completed, total the ratings. Using these totals, rank all the speakers from 1-8.

The speaker with the highest total should receive a rank of 1.

Do not allow ties!

APPENDIX 6

Name _____

Instructions to TV Operators:

- I. The project involves recording five minute speeches.
- II. It is important to record the speakers in the order indicated on the tape boxes. In some cases numbers will appear that have no name. In this case place a six minute blank spot on the tape.
- III. A timer will be available to assist you. The timer will perform the following tasks.
 - A. The timer will escort the speaker into the room and check his name against a list that should correspond to the names that appear on the tape box. The timer will also write the student's name on the blackboard. The name should appear on the tape for a cross-check.
 - B. When the timer is seated he will indicate that the speaker should begin. After 4 minutes and 30 seconds the timer will raise his hand to signal the speaker that he has 30 seconds to complete. After the 30 seconds the timer will stand. At this point the operator should stop the tape.
 - C. When the operator is placing a blank spot on the tape he should inform the timer after its completion.
 - D. In the majority of cases, nine speakers will be placed on one tape.

Instructions to Timers:

Name _____

- I. We will be operating on a close time schedule, so the task of timer is extremely important.
- II. The following items are critical.
 - A. The order of speakers must be maintained. You will be given a list of the speakers involved and those that will be recorded on each tape.
 - B. Speakers will be waiting outside the door. Only one speaker should enter.
 - C. Remember the following items:
 1. The student will enter the room and you will check his name on the list. Then write his name on the blackboard. Seat yourself so that he can see you. Tell him to commence.
 2. At the 4 minute - 30 second mark you will raise your hand to notify the speaker that he has 30 seconds to conclude. At the five minute mark stand. If he continues to speak, signal the operator of the equipment to stop the tape.
 3. Your list may include blank spaces. These will be filled in by blank tape. The operator will signal you when this has been completed. You will then usher in the next speaker.

APPENDIX 7

GENERAL DIRECTIONS TO JUDGES

1. The rating blanks require that you fill in five general categories. The ratings are totaled and then converted to ranks. Do not allow ties.
2. The operator will call out the number of the tape and the names that should appear at the top of the form.
3. The operator will pause briefly after each speaker so that you can fill in all the blanks with the exception of the total and the ranks. At the conclusion of all speeches the operator will give you time to total all scores and rank the speakers. The operator will check to see that everyone has completed before moving to the next set of speakers.
4. If the tape is not visible or some difficulty should occur press the button on the intercom and ask the operator to stop the tape.
5. Do not hesitate to ask questions.
6. Some of the speeches are quite short. Judge them according to what they are. How well do they meet the standards of communication in general? A list of topics is attached so that you can see what the assignment was.